



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/243,433	02/08/2002	YUNG-TSUN LO	REF/LO535CIP	2498

7590 12/04/2003  
BACON & THOMAS  
625 SLATERS LANE  
4TH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 223141176

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2812

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RF

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/243,433

Applicant(s)

LO ET AL.

Examiner

Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2812

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 February 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1 and 6 recites the limitation "depositing tungsten metal" in lines 9. It appears that Ti/TiN bilayer is also deposited using a clamp ring (see claim 2 and claim 6, lines 11-13). Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 variously depend from claim 1 or 6, they are objected to for the same reason.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103<sup>o</sup> and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "APA") in view of Kinoshita et al. (USPN 5332691, hereinafter "Kinoshita") and Foster et al. (USPN 5273588, hereinafter "Foster").

[Claim 1] APA discloses a process for manufacturing by CVD a W-plug in a semiconductor device which comprises depositing a SiO<sub>2</sub> insulation layer on top of a substrate by CVD, then depositing a layer of BPSG onto the SiO<sub>2</sub> layer for surface planarization by employing CVD again; partially etching the SiO<sub>2</sub> layer and the BPSG layer to form a contact

Art Unit: 2812

hole to the substrate; performing ion implantation through the contact hole and forming the device in the substrate; sputter depositing a barrier metal layer comprising a Ti and TiN bilayer in which the Ti metal is underneath the TiN in the Ti/TiN bilayer; depositing W nucleation layer and W bulk metal using a quartz clamp ring to control the area; forming the W-plug in the contact hole by a plasma anisotropic etch back procedure (See back ground section ). But it does not disclose expressly the use of two CVD chambers with different clamp rings; sputtering an Al/Si/Cu layer and patterning metal line. However, the missing limitation is well known in the art because Kinoshita discloses the use of two different CVD chambers to deposit W, sputtering an interconnect layer 9 and patterning the interconnect layer (See Fig. 1D and col. 5, lines 9-15, line 51-col. 6, line 10); and Foster discloses the use of different clamp rings to fit the desired surface for deposition (see col. 18, lines 37-56). The combined teaching of APA, Kinoshita, and Foster does not disclose Al/Si/Cu interconnect. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that Al/Si/Cu is the most common interconnect material used in the art. A person of ordinary skill is motivated to modify APA with Kinoshita and Foster to obtain fabrication process flexibility and easy control.

[Claim 6] The combined teaching of APA, Kinoshita and Foster discloses substantially the limitations of claim 6, as shown above. Kinoshita also discloses the use of  $WF_6$  and  $SiH_4$  and  $WF_6$  and  $H_2$  to deposit layers of W (see col. 4, lines 25-54).

[Claims 2-4 and 7-9] The combined teaching of APA, Kinoshita, and Foster discloses substantially the limitations of claims 2-4, as shown above. But it does not disclose the width of the different rings for depositing Ti/TiN, W nucleation, W bulk layers. However any variation in width of the rings in the present claims is obvious in light of the cited art, because the changes in ring width produce no unexpected function.

The routine varying of parameters to produce expected changes are within the ability of one of ordinary skill in the art. Patentability over the prior art will only occur if the parameter variation produces an unexpected result. In re Aller, Lacey and Hall, 105 U.S.P.Q. 233, 235. In re Reese 129 U.S.P.Q. 402, 406.

[Claims 5 and 10] Kinoshita also discloses a W nucleation in the range of 250 to 500 Å (see col. 4, lines 11-22 and col. 5, lines 35-50).

Art Unit: 2812

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine APA with Kinoshita and Foster to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1-10.

4. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kinoshita and Foster, as applied above, and further in view of Merchant et al. (USPN 5489552, hereinafter "Merchant").

The combined teaching of APA, Kinoshita and Foster discloses substantially the limitations of claims 11 and 12, as shown above.

But it does not disclose expressly the formation of TiN by rapid thermal nitridation and the conditions used.

However, the missing limitations are well known in the art because Merchant discloses these features (See col. 3, lines 25-52).

A person of ordinary skill is motivated to modify APA, Kinoshita and Foster with Merchant to obtain TiN in a suitable manner.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine APA, Kinoshita and Foster with Merchant to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11 and 12.

### *Conclusion*

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ha Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-2706, after Feb. 3, 2004, the new phone number will be (703) 272-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM, except the first Friday of each bi-week. The telephone number for Wednesday is (703) 560-0528.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Neibling, can be reached on (703) 308-3325. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Ha Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
11- 28- 03